



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Present and Past Periphrastic Tenses in Anglo-Saxon. By CONSTANCE PESSELS, Ph. D., Instructor in English in the University of Texas. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner, 1896. Pp. 83.

The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon. By MORGAN CAL-LAWAY, Jr., Professor of English in the University of Texas. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, vol. XVI, No. 2, pp. 141-360. Baltimore, 1901.

During the eight years since the publication of the first part of Dr. J. E. Wülfing's exhaustive work on the Syntax of Alfred, the field of Old English syntax has attracted fewer investigators than for several years previously. On this side of the Atlantic there have appeared but three additions to the list of monographs in my "Bibliographical Guide" (1895); of these, two are concerned with the same general topic as the earliest American dissertation in the field—the Old English participle.

The first, Dr. Pessels' treatise on "The Present and Past Periphrastic Tenses in Anglo-Saxon," bears the imprint of Trübner, of Strassburg; but, when one discovers that a typical page (28) contains eleven obvious errors in printing, and that the word "progressive" is spelled somewhat indifferently with one *s* and with two, one cannot suppress the thought that if the author had not time for the requisite proof-reading, he should have employed a printer nearer home, and one whose native language was English.

Unfortunately, this carelessness is not confined to the printing of the book; it is characteristic. The author's work is conceived on sufficiently broad lines; his collections may fairly claim to be exhaustive; but one feels at every turn that his whole heart has not been in his work, and that details of every sort have been slighted. Thus (p. 18, foot), he makes *indicative* (in the abbreviation *ind.*) and *deponent* (*dep.*) correlative terms. Again, his arithmetic is faulty: on p. 67, he makes  $\frac{12}{47}$  only 3% (instead of 15%) greater than  $\frac{3}{20}$ . In fact, one need not go further than the title-page: the word "periphrastic" applies equally to all compound tenses; but the author uses it in a restricted sense, for the forms made up of the verb *to be* with present participles, without deeming it at all necessary to give notice of the fact.

To proceed to matters of more importance, the constitution of his quotations is extremely careless; they are often so short as

to be of no practical value for the illustration of his statements. No device, other than three tables—only the first of which can be regarded as of conclusive value—, has been introduced for making the work easy of comprehension at a glance. The work throughout is monotonous and unrelieved; until the reader is driven to suspect that the lack of perspective in the book is but the reflection of a similar lack in the author's mind.

Dr. Pessels' results, so far as they concern the verb-*forms* under survey, are open to little objection; he derives these from the compound tenses of Latin, and properly lays much stress on the influence of the Latin deponent verbs. But in the treatment of the *functions* of these forms, the author is fairly beyond his depth. Nothing shows this more clearly than a strange and apparently quite unconscious inexactness in the use of terms, which greatly detracts from the value and authority of his statements. He nowhere makes a sharp discrimination—nor, so far as can be seen, does he even realize that discrimination is desirable—between progressive and durative uses of the past tense, nor is he able to see any essential difference between "was going" and "used to go"; yet, in his final chapter, he repeatedly uses the term "progressive" as if it were, to him and to his readers, a word of absolutely definite meaning. It may well be so to his readers; but the source of their information will not have been this monograph.

Again, the author has apparently quite failed to realize that the exact shade of meaning expressed by a given verb cannot be determined either by guess-work or by lottery. In his Introduction, after reviewing the utterances of past grammarians upon the subject in hand, he proposes to "record" all the occurrences of periphrastic tenses in Old English, and so to decide where doctors have disagreed. A record may perhaps be sufficient for establishing the origin of verb-*forms*—these frequently demand the consideration of nothing outside themselves; thus far Pessels is successful. But the study of verbal functions is a matter of much greater complexity. Here the whole sentence must be included in the view. It is true that the verb is one of the most elementary components of the sentence, but it is no less true that the reasons for the employment of a given verb-form, and no other—and these reasons are the goal of Dr. Pessels' quest—can be accurately determined only after all the other components which enter into the expression of the complete idea have been duly weighed. For example, nothing would be of so great assistance in determining the presence of "progressive" force in a given verb, or its absence from it, as to know whether it occurs in a principal or a secondary clause, and the relation of the tenses in the two clauses; if the word "progressive" has any meaning in grammar, it denotes the progress of an action relatively—either to present time, or to that of some other action. Flamme, quoted by Pessels, p. 5, has already pointed out that "*Gleichzeitigkeit*" is

one of the leading ideas expressed by the Old English periphrastic tenses. And yet Pessels never even tells us, except possibly by a mere accident, whether the sentence contains any other verb beside the one under view, to say nothing of more detailed information. He is sadly deficient in perception of what is essential to the discussion. He ignores points of prime importance, and then wastes time in such fruitless labor as the separate treatment of all his subjunctives; considerations of mode are absolutely foreign to his problem.

He does indeed draw a line between the cases in which the periphrastic form has a "temporal modifier" and those in which it has not, a distinction which might be of some value. But he undertakes no classification of these modifiers, according as they express point of time, duration, repetition, goal, etc.; so that, in the paragraph (pp. 59 ff.) where occurs the fullest discussion of the subject, accusatives of extent, adverbs like *dæghwamlice*, and *oð ðæt* clauses are all united as "denoting continuance." Moreover, the collection is very carelessly made; I may perhaps be pardoned for printing a list, by no means exhaustive, of errors from Bede. Among cases "accompanied by a temporal modifier," figures wrongly 348, 4: "*Ne þinre forþfore swa neah is, nu þu þus rotlice and þus glæddlice to us sprecende eart*," where the author has mistaken the conjunction *nu* for an adverb. Among those "without a temporal modifier," occur 94, 11: "*he nu hwonne on þam ilcan bið on wuldre arisende*" (*nu hwonne* = Lat. *quandoque*, which the author probably took for a conjunction); 398, 26: "*wæs ic in ða ærestan tid minre geoguðhadnisse in his geferscipe drohtigende*"; 108, 8: "*he ða (= ðissum tidum, ante) wæs smeagende mid þone . . . þapan Bonifatii*"; 202, 25 (should be 26) "*þa wæs he . . . noht feorr from þære byrig, þe we ær foresprecende wæron*."

Criteria were at hand for enabling the author to get results approaching definiteness; but he has apparently preferred to classify his examples by inspiration. Inspiration is, however, at least in linguistic matters, sadly subject to moods; and figures, such as those in the tables on pp. 52 f., which are based upon it, can be accepted only as expressions of temporary opinion or feeling. "Historical perfects" there may be here; but the author has carefully refrained from telling us how he distinguished them from other uses of the past tense.

So much for the general aspects of the work; a few special points may be worthy of mention. On p. 23, in Bede 346, 29, *on æfenne þære neahste þe he of worulde gongende wæs*, the verb is grouped with others as a "Future Preterite"; this may be worth noting as an early example of our familiar use of "is going" and "is coming" with future force (cf. French *je vais*, especially in periphrases like *je vais acheter* = I am going to buy). An exhaustive study of this interesting development of verbs of motion, in our own and other languages (cf. Lat. *amatum iri*), would be a pretty piece of work.

In the same paragraph, when he says that three other cases from Bede (212, 25 (2); 108, 11), which correspond to a Latin future participle, "express the Future Preterite," the author fails to note that, owing to a complete change of construction in the Old English version, all future sense is lost; these three verbs express simple past time, though the employment of the periphrastic *form* may well be due to the influence of the Latin participle.

On p. 56, Pessels discusses the interesting double glosses (e. g. *læg vel licgende wæs*) in the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels; he feels that these are due to a conflict in the author's mind between form and signification. Those which gloss Latin dependent perfects are accounted for on the ground of form. But those which correspond to imperfects cannot be explained so easily; and here Pessels performs one of his most astonishing feats. As a fundamental statement, he "assumes" that "the periphrasis has something of the force of the Modern English progressive"; and says that the glossator has regarded it as appropriate here because of the progressive idea inherent in the Latin imperfect (this statement is too strong; the Latin imperfect is a tense of relative time, but by no means always of progressive force; the author must not be misled by the "*amabam* = I was loving" of the school-grammars). Pessels then continues (p. 57), "that there should be some *weakening* of the progressive force (after this violent transference from Modern to Old English) is not surprising, but that this force *continued* in the periphrasis is amply testified by the examples here collected, and its final triumph in the subsequent history of the language." (Italics and parenthesis are mine.) This is a rarely good example of the interesting mental process known as *Circulus in Probando*. The result is not necessarily wrong; *licgende wæs* may have distinctively progressive force; but "assumption" is not the best means of convincing us that such is the case.

P. 58 (cf. p. 15), from Logeman's "Rule of St. Benet," Pessels cites three occurrences (he omits 26, 7, which is similar) of the present participle with *to*; all these gloss Latin gerundives, by the form of which they were undoubtedly influenced, as both terminate in *-end* (in fact, one instance, *smeagenda*, 26, 11, seems to have taken over *-enda* bodily from *requirenda*). The author fails to note that in 5, 14, *sin to gereccanne and lichama haligre beboda gehirsumnesse to campierende*, the participial form is coordinated with an inflected infinitive in *-enne*, of which it is here the equivalent and variant. All these cases are then infinitives of corrupt form, and have no place in Dr. Pessels' field.

It is a pleasure to turn from this immature work to a new study from the hand of Dr. Callaway, the earliest and best known of American investigators in Old English syntax. His treatise on "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon" is marked by all the qualities which made his study of The Absolute Participle so admirable; while the passage of twelve years has not un-

naturally added to the breadth and grasp of the author's view, the authority of his treatment, and the catholicity of his whole attitude.

The work, like its predecessor, is divided into seven sections: (1) Statistics, (2) Uses, and (3) Origin of the Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon, (4) Anglo-Saxon rendering of the Latin Appositive Participle, (5) Origin of the construction in the other Germanic languages, (6) the Anglo-Saxon Appositive Participle as a Norm of Style, and (7) a brief summary chapter of "Results." Owing to the far greater mass of material handled—3010 cases, as against 349—some of these chapters (especially, of course, the first) are much longer than the corresponding ones in the dissertation of 1889; but the treatment is at once compact without being crowded, and clear and adequate, while avoiding diffuseness. It can, I think, never be charged against Dr. Callaway that his data are meagre or his quotations too short; on the other hand, his judicious employment of tables and of skilful devices of printing makes economy of space entirely compatible with good perspective and complete lucidity.

Dr. Callaway preserves unchanged his early respectful attitude toward other investigators; he is agreeably free from that cocksureness which so often detracts from the effect of work of this sort; but the present treatise is marked by greater independence than his earlier study, and his *obiter dicta* give evidence of an increasingly philosophical attitude toward life, as well as toward the narrow problems of syntax. Independence, however, does not mean insistence, in Dr. Callaway's case; in fact, if there is an opposing view, he is the first to call attention to it; if any of his results are open to query, he prefers to raise the query himself. He pursues his own road in reaching his conclusions, but the whole work is marked by an unwillingness to dogmatize which is one of its chief recommendations.

The atmosphere of Pessels' book is murky, or at least hazy—one sees but a few things, and those indistinctly; but Callaway's work is full of light; definition and classification are alike simple, clear, concise. In fact, the present monograph offers a contrast to Pessels' work at almost every point; and one could hardly have a better preparation than a reading of the latter if he would properly appreciate the care which Callaway has expended upon every least detail of his work.

The author conceives the scope of the term "appositive" as a broad one: he applies it not only to participles which express an adverbial idea, but to those which are equivalent to a relative clause. He defends this liberal interpretation skilfully (especially by means of the examples on pp. 272 f.), and (p. 149) urges the general acceptance of "appositive participle" as a grammatical category with an application similar in all respects to that of "noun in apposition."

After giving some guesses at the probable order of development of the various uses of the participle, he turns with apparent relief

from the region of speculation to "matters about which a reasonable degree of certainty is possible," and treats of the inflexion and the position (prevailing postpositive) of the appositive participle.

One cannot help admiring the author's clearness of arrangement in the long chapter (112 pages) of statistics; the examples occurring in each work of Old English prose and poetry are listed separately, while figures are introduced at every step to show exactly the relations of part to whole. (It is only fair to Dr. Pessels to say that he follows the same plan, the excellence of which is, however, largely obscured in his case by the clumsiness of the printing.) The schematic arrangement of Callaway's work is usually quite free from the woodenness which so often characterizes German work of this sort. But, in his desire to give formal balance to his statistics from the Boethius (pp. 167 f.), the author has twice introduced the caption, "II. With an Object (o)", followed by the grave statement, "No example." An American cannot afford to waste space and printer's ink in this fashion. At the end of the chapter, the statistical results are brought together into a two-page table which shows all the significant facts at a glance, with summations so frequent as to give one control of every step in the author's processes, and to answer one's questions almost before they arise.

The art of constructing tables is one in which Dr. Callaway is especially strong; those which follow and summarize Chap. II (pp. 292-296), exhibiting the "uses" of the appositive participle, and Chap. III (pp. 315-320), showing the Latin equivalents of the participles in Old English translations, are triumphs of lucidity.

The author draws his lines of classification between prose and poetry; between present and past tenses; and between participles with an object and those without. His interpretation of the term "object" with past participles is a very liberal one; it includes any noun-modifier of the participle. He would probably not put this forward as a definition, but for his purpose—the determination of the peculiarly verbal element in these participles—the extension has a practical value.

It is impossible that in so large a collection there should not be some cases in the classification of which any two investigators would differ. The distinction between the attributive and appositive uses of the participle is largely one of emphasis: if the idea expressed by the participle is the one of chief importance—if it is a *necessary* qualification—the participle is likely to be attributive, and to precede its noun; but, as it gradually loses in emphasis, and becomes first simply descriptive, and then the mere addition of something more or less extraneous, it becomes appositive, and tends to follow its noun. I should incline to regard two examples on p. 223—Luke I, 27 and Matt. XI, 7—as attributive. Again, as the author suggests, it is difficult to distinguish sharply between adverbial uses of the participle and

those which are equivalent to modal clauses. Callaway lists a number of such cases on p. 275, where he makes the excellent suggestion that these expressions are properly not participles, but participial adverbs, and should be so called, as in the grammar of other languages. It seems to me that the negative element in *unwandiende* (Greg. 381, 25, p. 171), *ungewitnode* (Greg. 117, 23, p. 174), and *ungeniedde* (Greg. 137, 19, ib.) sets them beyond question in the same category.

Like Pessels—only with a vast difference—Callaway gives the Latin originals, where they exist, of all his examples. One of his captions constantly appears in the form: "An A.-S. appositive participle corresponds to a Latin finite verb, which finite verb is usually in immediate connection with an appositive participle." This statement seems too strong; in 9 out of 23 occurrences, the Latin verb has no participle near it. In one case (p. 185, Benedict 22, 10), where *myngað clypiende* = Lat. *clamat dicens*, *dicens*, rather than *clamat*, should probably be given as the source of *clypiende*.

P. 230, Note 2, Callaway mentions some examples of "pure adverbs" from The Rule of St. Benet. The study of glosses can, it seems to me, have but slight value for syntactical purposes: the evidence which they furnish may be confirmatory of results gained elsewhere, but taken alone it is a very insufficient ground for any opinion whatever. The glosses are little more than collections of English words; it is only by mere chance that they ever contain real English sentences. *Teonde*, in the two examples cited, may "seem in use to be a pure adverb"; but all one can say with certainty is that the glossator set it down as the nearest approach *in form* to *subtrahendo* and *protrahendo*, respectively. The corresponding passages from Benedict, which Dr. Callaway subjoins in brackets, show how a *translator* treated these Latin words. It would seem that Callaway gives himself quite too much anxiety over Benet. In a note on p. 229, he gravely defines six present participles found there as verbal nouns, though the usage has no parallel elsewhere; this would be very interesting were Benet not a gloss; as it is, the suggestion cannot be taken seriously. The author forgets that he is dealing with what the Germans would call "Unenglisch."

Under "conditional uses" (p. 285), Callaway lists ten cases of the familiar expression "*geteled rime(s)*", following numerals, from the poetry. His second thought on these cases (pp. 305f.) is better: here he says, "the participle is not unmistakably conditional," and "its use appears to have been phraseological, rather than syntactical." We have to do here with a pure idiomatic construction; the user was quite unconscious of *geteled* as a separate syntactical element in the sentence; the exact analysis of such expressions would be possible only in a more primitive stage of the language.

Some of Callaway's notes on minor points in passing are suggestive. The discussion of a number of participles from the



Gospels, hitherto cited as appositive (pp. 224 f.), is interesting; though in Luke IX, 34, it is just as easy to take *him* as reflexive dative with *ondredon* (in which case *gangende* is appositive), as to say that it combines with *gangende* to form a "crude" absolute dative; on its face, the former explanation is the natural one; the Latin original, *intransibis illis*, lends color to the latter. On p. 225, Professor Bright, as editor, inserts a footnote, still maintaining his position in regard to "*hine bewend*," (= *conversus*, Luke IX, 55), where, according to his view, *hine* is carried over from the active voice.

Callaway's attitude (p. 291) toward the "pleonastic *and*," which often occurs with participles, is very sane, as is his treatment on the preceding page of "supplementary particles," added to give color. In the note (p. 290) on Passive Participles in an Active Sense, where he is entirely right in insisting that *druncen* has passive force, he seems to have mistaken the ground-meaning of *forscylðigian* (= "to condemn"); *forscylðigod* (Ælf. Hom. I, 66, 12) is no less passive than *druncen*.

Callaway reaches the conclusion that the spirit of Old English was favorable only to those appositive participles which had pronounced adjectival (descriptive) force; and that those with clearly verbal force are either not appositive or not of native origin. For example, the participles which denote manner are numerous in the poetry and original prose, and are thus probably native; but those denoting means, which retain more of their verbal character, can practically always be traced to a Latin source. The author is able to show that, common and natural as it seems, the temporal use, except of a very few participles of but slight verbal force, is not native to our language. Moreover, the Old English present participle, when used appositively, had not originally the power of governing a direct object; while of the appositive preterite participle with a direct object, there is in all the literature only the single doubtful case mentioned above (Luke IX, 55, *hine bewend*).

As one reads the section on the Governing Power of the Participle (pp. 307-314), one can hardly escape the feeling that here, if anywhere, the author's ingenuity has got the better of him. In no part of the book does he show greater command of resources; his arguments, taken separately, are very convincing; but they are too varied—one feels that he is tilting at a mark which he is determined to demolish, and that, for every new face which it shows, he makes a dash from a different quarter. His disposal of a large number of cases from the poetry as accusative compounds is very clever; he shows much insight on this point. But one feels that in inventing Latin sources for all other troublesome cases, his facility is so great as to excite question.

The chapter on Old English renderings of the Latin appositive participle (pp. 321 ff.) is full of interest. The author admits at the outset that "no principle has been consistently followed by

the Anglo-Saxon translators"; this is another example of that ability to make due allowance for individuality in both Anglo-Saxons and modern investigators which is so refreshing a trait throughout the author's work. In section II (pp. 323 ff.), by an odd mistake, his headings read, "The Latin Temporal (Relative, etc.) Clause," where he means the Latin appositive participle equivalent to such a clause.

One of the most valuable features of Callaway's tables, referred to above, is the light they shed on stylistic questions. In his chapter (pp. 344 ff.) on the Anglo-Saxon Appositive Participle as a Norm of Style, the author discusses these facts with admirable liveliness. He shows the value of the construction as an element in Old English style, and almost leaves one with the impression that literary men consciously set about to transplant so valuable a resource from Latin into their own language, and to propagate it there. He illustrates the advance in this point from Alfred to Ælfric by a contrast between New High German and Modern English, and inspires in the reader a feeling of real sympathy for the destitute condition of Alfred and the Germans. He regards the introduction of the appositive present participle with the power of governing an object as the chief contribution of the Late West Saxon writers to English prose style.

There is still left for consideration one of the most important features of the book: I refer to the inclusion, as a separate category, under the name "Co-ordinate Participle," of appositive participles essentially equivalent to independent clauses, which either (1) denote an accompanying circumstance, or (2) repeat the idea of the principal verb. These uses, which are recognized by writers on Greek and Latin syntax, have received scant treatment at the hands of English and Germanic grammarians. A couple of examples will suggest the familiarity of the participle employed in this way: *behyddon his lichaman, secgende* (Ælf. L. S., I, 146, 458); *hy awehton hyne, ðus cweðende* (Matt. VIII, 25). In each case, the participle might as well have been a verb connected by *and*. But, while Callaway does well in frankly accepting this as a new category, and in not attempting to range these examples under the old heads, one feels that the possession of the category has been a constant temptation to him, and that he has used it as a sort of catch-all. Of the 23 cases listed as "Circumstantial" on pp. 286 f., I should be inclined to question all but 8; of the 15 discarded, I regard 3 (Bened. 30, 3; Metres of Boeth. 20, 214, 221) as iterative; the others are, I should say, modal—a possibility which the author himself admits on p. 307. On the latter page, and the one preceding it, may be found another interesting example of Dr. Callaway's ingenuity in the construction of evidence; here he actually goes so far as to cite other writers, against his own earlier statements, as authority for throwing out certain cases which were in the way of his endeavor to establish a Latin source for the "Co-ordinate Use."

There remains only the duty of pointing out a few additional

errors in printing not noted by the author, in a work whose typography is in general as careful as its whole execution is admirable. P. 158, l. 18, for *hauperibus* read *pauperibus*; p. 276, l. 5, for *si* read *se*; p. 287, l. 13, for *immitans* read *imitans*; l. 20, for *Bæth.* read *Boeth.*; l. 29, for *transuivit* read *transiuit*; pp. 345, 346, 347, wherever the difference between Modern English and New High German is compared to that between Alfred and Ælfric, the order should be transposed; it is Alfred, not Ælfric, who is on a par with the Germans.

CENTRAL UNIVERSITY, DANVILLE, KY.

FRANK H. CHASE.

D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae con note di ENRICO CESAREO, Libro I, Satira I (71 pp.); Satira II (50 pp.). Messina, 1900.

It is often the experience of the teacher to take up a new book with pleasurable anticipation, to examine it, at first with eagerness, then with waning interest, and finally to lay it aside in disappointment. Such, I doubt not, will be the feelings of every American student of Juvenal into whose hands may fall the latest foreign edition of this author.

In the preface we are told that the editor has had before him several of the older commentaries as well as the most important editions of the last century except those of Mayor and Lewis. As far as the text is concerned, he professes to follow Friedländer save in a few cases where he has adopted another reading "*dopo matura riflessione*". On questions of etymology—which, by the way, need scarcely be discussed in a work of this sort—he relies on Doderlein (?) and Vansicêk (sic!) and closes his preface with the hope "*La buona intenzione, se non altro, mi procuri il compatimento dell' indulgente lettore*".

An examination of the very full commentary reveals the fact that the editor has contributed very little to the interpretation or illustration of the satires except a few more or less relevant passages from Dante, Ariosto and other Italian poets. Moreover, his knowledge of the recent important literature bearing on his author seems to be confined to what he could gather from Friedländer and Duff. For example, he makes no note of Housman's ingenious and almost certain explanation of I, 144 *intestata senectus* as 'old age unwitnessed' (Class. Rev., XIII, 1899, pp. 432 f.) nor does he mention the Bodleian fragments which furnish the most remarkable illustration of passages in the second satire. In short, the edition of Cesareo seems to serve no good purpose, being far too copious for the young student, and, for reasons suggested, of little value to the teacher and scholar. Fortunately only two parts have as yet appeared, and it is to be hoped, for the sake of all concerned, that the publication will not be carried to completion.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.